HN

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,351	10/19/2000	Thomas Anthony Gregg	AUS9-2000-0628-US1	6897

			EXAMINER
35525	7590	06/15/2005	SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/692,351	GREGG ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Mohammad A. Siddiqi	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _14 April 2005_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐. Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _02/22/05_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are presented for examination.

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 02/22/2005 was filed after the mailing date of the office action on 01/14/2005. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah et al. (6,694,361) (hereinafter Shah) in view of "Official Notice".

5.   AS per claims 1, 9, and 17, Shah discloses a method, program and

system for routing data packets to multiple partitions (partition manager, col

7, lines 37-41) within a single end node, comprising:

assigning a range of local identification addresses (LIDs) to a channel

adapter port an end node (elements, fig 6, col 8, lines 42-51); and

assigning value (col 10, lines 49-54) within the local identification addresses

to specify which of several partitions within the end node is being addressed

(each port can be uniquely identified, col 8, lines 42-51). Shah, however,

does not explicitly discloses assigning bits within the LIDS. "Official Notice "

is taken that the concept of control bit masking is well known in the art.

One of the ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that creating a

control mask and assigning LIDS to the bits (an arrangement of bits in a

word or register that assigns logical significance to corresponding bits in

other words) would need optimize processing and the routing. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Shah with well known concept of bit

masking and assigning bits to channels. The motivation would have been

assigning mapping lids with bits for optimal routing path finding.

6.   As per claims 2, and 10, claims are rejected for the similar reasons as

claim 1 above. In addition, Shah discloses the bits are lower order bits (col

10, lines 49-54).

7.   As per claims 3, 11, and 18, Shah discloses the channel adapter port is

connected to a system area network (624, fig 6).

8.   As per claims 4, 12, and 19, Shah discloses the network contains two

raised to the N power end nodes, switches, and routers (fig 6); and

        the number of bits in local identification address equals N (cluster, fig

        6, col 24-40).

9.   As per claims 5, 13, and 20, claims are rejected for the same reasons

as claim 1, above. Shah discloses the lower order bits assigned to partitions

are designated by a local identification mask control (LMC) field (multiple of

16, col 10, lines 49-54).

10.   As per claims 6, 14, and 21, claims are rejected for the same reasons

as claim 1, above. Shah discloses the local identification mask control can

be any number of bits (multiple of 16, col 10, lines 49-54).

11.   As per claims 7, 15, and 22, claims are rejected for the same reasons

as claim 1, above. Shah discloses the number of lower order bits assigned

to addressing within a port is up to two raised to the local identification mask

control power (multiple of 16, col 10, lines 49-54).

12.   As per claims 8, 16, and 23, Shah discloses the different local

identification addresses of a port identify different partitions (col 8, lines 42-

51).

Response to Arguments

13.   Applicant's arguments filed 04/14/2005 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive, therefore rejections to claims 1-23 is maintained.

14.   In the remarks applicants argued that:

Argument: Shah does not teach routing multiple packets to partitions.

Response: Examiner respect fully disagrees, Shah teaches routing data

packets (col 3, lines 15-20, routing data from source to a target node) to

multiple partitions (partition manager that assigns partition keys anticipates

partition manager assigning key to partitions, col 7, lines 37-41) within a

single end node (col 3, lines 15-20 and col 7, lines 37-41).

Argument: Shah does not teach assigning a range of LIDS to a port.

Response: Examiner respect fully disagrees, Shah teaches assigning a range of local identification addresses (LIDs) (col 8, lines 42-45, assigning unique addresses to fabric-attached ports, unique addresses must include range) to a channel adapter port an end node (elements, fig 6, col 8, lines 42-51).

Argument: Shah does not teach assigning bits within the LIDS.

Response: Examiner respect fully disagrees, Shah teaches assigning value (the smallest unit of information a computer can use. A bit is represented as a "0" or a "1", and these are the binary value of the bit, value 16 represents 4 bits, col 10, lines 45-54, LID stride value is a tunable parameter of LID) within the local identification addresses to specify which of several partitions within the end node is being addressed (each port can be uniquely identified, col 8, lines 42-51, the concept of control bit masking is well known in the art. One of the ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that creating a control mask and assigning LIDS to the bits (an arrangement of bits in a word or register that assigns logical significance to corresponding bits in other words) would need optimize processing and the routing. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use the well known concept of bit masking and assigning bits to channels.

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the

extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to

expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a

first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action

and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-

MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will

expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply

expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications

from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A. Siddiqi whose

telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be

reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-

3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained

from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status

information for published applications may be obtained from either Private

PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is

available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100